UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,388	09/27/2000	Michael Ginsberg	MS150832.2	6789

27195 7590 04/04/2006		

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
ZIA, SYED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/671,388	GINSBERG, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Syed Zia	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 November 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 7-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on November 14, 2005. Original

application contained Claims 1-20. Applicant previously amended Claims 1-3, 7-9, 10,12, and

15-17. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office

action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. Therefore, presently

pending claims are 1-5, and 7-20.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-5, and 7-20 have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1.   Claims 1-5, and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate by Gupta

(U.S. Patent No. 6,990,492).

2.   As per claims 1, 10, and 12, Gupta teaches the claimed system or method for regulating

access to a distributed computing platform (see Figure 7-9B), comprising:

        a component that analyzes an application that requests access to the distributed

computing platform, the component determines a level of access to the distributed computing

platform and applies a trust level to the application corresponding to the determined level of

access, and a component that compares the applied trust level of the application with a trust level

of a module called by the application and regulates access of the application to the distributed

computing platform based at lest in part upon the comparison (col. 9, line 65 to col.11 line 23).

3.   Claims 2-9, 11, and 13-20 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claims 1, 10, and 12.

Furthermore, Gupta teaches and describes controlled access mechanism, wherein:

        As per claims 2 and 19, the component that analyzes the application inherently provides

for inheritance of the trust level in the distributed computing environment (col.7 line 1 to line 30,

and col.8 line 40 to line 67).

        As per claims 3 and 13, the component that analyzes the application provide for marking

the application with at least one of states: (1) fully trusted, (2) run restricted, and (3) fail to load,

can be implemented by a person of ordinary in the art without departing from the spirit and scope

of the invention since the authentication service in Anglin's system can perform this function

(col, 7 line 64 to col.8 line 36).

As per claim 4, the component is stored in a ROM in the platform (Fig.6 col.8 line 29 to line 36, and col. 11 line 23 to line 34).

As per claim 5, the component is part of an operating system platform (Fig.6 col.8 line 29 to line 36, and col. 11 line 23 to line 34).

As per claim 7, the functionality of one or more Application Programming call Interface (API) calls, when called by the module, can also be selectively restricted depending on which authentication service is used to indicate the level of access or trust (col. 3, line 40 to line 63).

As per claims 8-9, and 16, wherein selectively restricting the functionality of one or more API calls includes restricting the functionality to read functions, and terminating the application (Fig.6, col. 9 line 15 to line 45).

As per claim 11, applying the trust level to one or more modules called by the application since the authentication service in Anglin is also used in a distributed computing environment (col. 6, line 48 to line 67).

As per claim 14, the trust level for the first module further comprises transmitting the first module to a verification program (col7, line 32 to col.8 line 35).

As per claim 15, wherein regulating access to the distributed computing platform comprises selectively abort calls made to one or more APIs (column 10, line 24 to line 36).

As per claims 17 and 18, for applying the trust level to regulate access to the platform (distributed computing environment) is stored in a ROM in the platform, and trust level may be inherited (Fig.6 and col.8 line 24 to line 36 and col.11 line 23 to line 34).

As per claim 20, trust level may be applied to one or more second modules called by the first module (col.6 line 10 to line 45).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The

examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sz
March 29, 2006